



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Evaluation/Reflection

Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning
and Community Engagement (SLCE)

3-25-1994

Report of the Evaluation Task Force

Corporation for National and Community Service

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceeval>



Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Corporation for National and Community Service, "Report of the Evaluation Task Force" (1994). *Evaluation/Reflection*. 5.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceeval/5>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Evaluation/Reflection by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



CORPORATION FOR
NATIONAL
AND
COMMUNITY
SERVICE

Report of the
Evaluation Task Force

March 25, 1994
Version for Public Release

120

8

ENC.

1994

NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Corporation for National Service is:

To engage Americans of all ages and backgrounds in community-based service. This service will address the nation's educational, public safety, human and environmental needs in order to achieve direct and demonstrable results. In fulfilling its mission, the Corporation will foster civic responsibility, strengthen the ties that bind us together as a people and provide educational opportunity for those who make a substantial commitment to service.

The future of national service depends on the Corporation's ability to present convincing evidence that it is fulfilling its mission and to respond to the concerns of its various constituencies in a timely and effective manner. The evaluation efforts of the Corporation will play a significant role in each of these areas by:

- * Gathering and aggregating information to demonstrate program impacts on communities and participants.
- * Serving as a source of information to help improve program quality and management effectiveness at all levels.
- * Providing data in a timely manner to inform the decisions of policy-makers and key constituencies.

The purpose of this plan is to present a comprehensive evaluation strategy detailing how evaluation might best support the Corporation's mission. Because it is based on a philosophy of continuous improvement, it incorporates many strategies and responsibilities that must be performed in concert with other staffs.

Out of necessity, this plan focuses primarily on ways to evaluate the subtitles under the National and Community Services Act of 1990 as amended (NCSA). The size of the NCSA program portfolio and its recent creation demanded our attention. Even within the NCSA, the plan emphasizes the evaluation of AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America. Serious consideration, however, is still given to the evaluation needs of the National Civilian Community Corps. The Evaluation Task Force believes that the strategy proposed here is valuable to all NCSA evaluation activities.

The Evaluation Task Force recognizes that the activities under the Domestic Volunteer Services Act (DVSA) are not addressed in this document. The DVSA offices have staff and a budget. An evaluation plan for FY 1994 was prepared last year and is guiding this year's effort. That plan, however, requires review and revision in light of the statements on mission and principles framed in this document.

This plan is organized into six sections:

- I The Mission for Evaluation and Its Guiding Principles
 - II Objectives
 - III Basic Evaluation Questions
 - IV Information Gathering Techniques: How We Propose to Get Answers
 - V Products and Systems that Communicate the Answer
 - VI Partnerships
 - VII Implementation (not for general release)
- Technical Appendices

I - MISSION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

We will provide accurate, timely, and useful information to demonstrate results, improve program quality, and inform decisions.

The two philosophies of continuous improvement and reinventing government have regularly guided the development of our evaluation strategy. These philosophies have been formalized in the following working principles:

- * We will be responsive to and serve the needs of our stakeholders, including local programs, states, and Congressional decision-makers.
- * We will collect only information that is useful to demonstrate results, improve program effectiveness, and meet legislative requirements.
- * We will use multiple approaches to information collection so that we have various ways of knowing what and how programs are doing.
- * We will be partners with State Commissions and with programs in assessing and improving effectiveness.
- * We will minimize reporting requirements and interruption of program operations.
- * We will clearly communicate expectations and we will share the information we gather in ways that are useful.
- * We will take advantage of the potential of technology to link programs, State Commissions and the Corporation so all parts of the system can benefit from the knowledge of others.

II - OBJECTIVES

Our evaluation strategy has two primary objectives:

1. To assess the value of national service programs. Meeting this objective will require that we:
 - * Assess program impacts on communities, participants, and involved institutions.
 - * Collect descriptive information about communities, participants, and programs.
 - * Assess the satisfaction of our "customers" - e.g., service recipients, participants, community members, etc.
 - * Determine the return on the National Service investment.
2. To provide information on effective practices in support of both program improvement and policy decisions. Meeting this objective will require that we:
 - * Help identify effective (and ineffective) practices.
 - * Clearly communicate evaluation findings in formats and venues that will support program improvement.
 - * Work closely with program staff and the technical assistance group.
 - * Support programs, states, and grantees in developing, implementing, and sharing approaches to self-assessment and continuous program improvement.
 - * Put mechanisms in place to answer questions that arise or collect other data as needed by Corporate staff and policy makers.
 - * Fulfill statutory requirements.

III - THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS: WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

We have identified five categories of information we need to collect to meet our objectives. These categories are: information on program impacts; descriptive information on programs, participants, and the communities they serve; information on "customer" satisfaction; information on effective practices; and other information required by statute.

Information on Impacts

The ultimate measure of the Corporation's success will be the impact we have on the communities we serve and the participants we sponsor.

Impacts on Communities can be viewed in terms of the value of the direct work that is performed, in terms of the role our programs play in building stronger communities, and in terms of the changes that occur in educational institutions and other organizations as a result of involvement with our programs.

- * *Direct Impacts* will be measured on two dimensions: quantity of work accomplished (e.g., hours of literacy tutoring) and impact on the targeted beneficiaries (e.g., increased reading skills).
- * *Community Strengthening* is a more subtle impact that we will gauge by studying volunteer patterns, collaboration efforts among community-based organizations, and the extent to which diverse community members work together. We will also attempt to assess changes over time in the public's attitude toward community and toward national service. Finally, although we look at participant development as a separate impact (see below), one of the primary ways our programs may strengthen communities is by developing more active citizens.
- * *Institutional Impacts*, while pertinent to all subtitles, are of particular interest in the Learn and Serve programs. What internal changes take place in schools, school districts, or universities that have service programs? Has service-learning been integrated into the institution's culture and curriculum? For all subtitles, we are interested in the internal changes that occur in the organizations of partners and sponsors: Have policies or procedures changed as a result of working with our programs? Does the institution view service, community, and their role with regard to each differently?

Impacts on Participants. In addition to meeting public needs and building stronger communities, service programs should have a positive impact on those who provide the service. We propose to examine the benefits of service participation from the perspective of the participant, as well as the impact of service on their subsequent community, educational, and career activities. We will focus whenever possible on behavioral, not attitudinal outcomes for two reasons: (1) the difficulty of demonstrating clearly the independent effects of one or two years of service and (2) the need to limit the costs and burden associated with collecting data on participants.

Descriptive Information

To support more extensive evaluations, as well as to fulfill legislative requirements, we will collect and maintain basic information on the magnitude and variety of work being performed, the demographics of our participants, and basic program and community characteristics.

Information on Customer Satisfaction

All community service is local. One of the surest ways of sustaining service programs is ensuring customers are satisfied. We define customer in a broad sense: Do beneficiaries believe they are being well-served? Are partners pleased with their relationships? Are sponsors satisfied with their investment? For each of these questions, why or why not?

Information on Effective Practices

The information we collect is most powerful when it is used to improve the quality of our programs. With this in mind, we intend to evaluate what practices contribute to effective program start-up and effective program operations. We will also assess what Corporation practices and policies are most effective. Finally, we will work closely with program staff and the Technical Assistance group to help identify technical assistance needs.

Information required by Statute

The National Service Trust Act of 1993 is quite prescriptive in terms of evaluation. It sets standards for how we are to carry out evaluations, it details specific things we are to evaluate, and it specifies when we are to report results. Studies required by statute are included in the matrix that follows. Studies that are not covered elsewhere in the matrix or that must be included in a report to Congress due June 30, 1995, are listed at the end of the matrix. Appendix A details all the evaluation provisions of the statute.

IV - INFORMATION GATHERING STRATEGIES: HOW WE PROPOSE TO GET ANSWERS

The Evaluation group has two primary objectives: to assess the value of national service programs and to provide information on effective practices in support of program improvement and policy decisions. The following questions were derived from these objectives. Questions applicable to the first objective are divided into two categories covering communities and participants. Questions applicable to the second objective are similarly divided into implementation issues and statutory requirements. In the third column, Strategy for Obtaining Information, we have included only phrases to describe the strategies we are proposing. Expanded descriptions of these strategies follow the matrix.

Objective One: Assessing the value of national service programs. Although the following questions apply across subtitles, they do so in varying degrees. For instance, when we study K-12 Learn and Serve impacts, the focus will be primarily on participants with some assessment of institutional impacts and a lesser focus on service-recipient impacts. For the Higher Education programs, our focus will be equally distributed between participant and community impacts (with an emphasis on institutional changes). When studying AmeriCorps, we will be most interested in community impacts, with a substantial interest in participant impacts as well. In general the following questions are very broad and will be tailored to subtitle specific issues as appropriate.

COMMUNITIES

Question to be Answered	Timing	Strategy for Obtaining Information
INFORMATION ON IMPACTS		
• What work was performed by our programs? ¹ (e.g. 50,000 hours of safety patrols provided)	- Annually	- Develop and have programs complete Annual Program Accomplishment Survey
• What was the impact of the work performed on direct beneficiaries (e.g., 50 % reduction in incidents of school violence)?	- Annually - Years 1 and 2 - Longitudinally	- Develop and have programs complete Annual Program Accomplishment Survey ² - Sponsor a film documentary of our programs - Ensure all programs have a camera and videocam - Compare beneficiaries and similar groups not receiving services at select sites (comparison group study)
• What are the institutional impacts of our programs on sponsors, partners, or involved institutions?	- Annually - Longitudinally	- Conduct pre- and post- interviews/focus groups with key staff from involved institutions - Conduct sample survey - Note changes over time based on annual efforts

¹ The Corporation is required to submit this information annually to Congress.

² In many cases accomplishments will directly reflect intended impacts. However, for some programs it will be difficult to determine just what portion of change is attributable to our service efforts because of the other variables involved. In these cases, accomplishments will not reflect ultimate impacts. For example, an accomplishment may address number of children reached by a health van, but not resulting increases in health status.

Objective One: Assessing the value of national service programs (continued)

Question to be Answered	Timing	Strategy for Obtaining Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do our programs build stronger communities?³ Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many non-participant volunteers do they leverage? - Do they foster increased collaboration among community-based organizations? - Do they increase the number of activities that bring diverse community members together? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually - Year 1 and 2 - Longitudinally - Annually - Every few years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Require programs to keep track of and report on non-participant volunteer hours through Evaluation Data System - Conduct pre- and post- interviews/focus groups with key staff from involved institutions - Note changes over time based on annual efforts - Use Evaluation Data System to determine participant mix - Note changes over time through interviews and focus groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the return on the national service investment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform cost-benefit analysis as appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is the public aware of and supportive of national service? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Longitudinally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase questions in national polls
<p>DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have distressed areas been served?⁴ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross tabulate information in Evaluation Data System with existing data bases (Census, Labor Statistics, HUD, etc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do our programs look like and what types of services do they provide? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Evaluation Data System
<p>INFORMATION ON SATISFACTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are service recipients, program sponsors, program partners, and community members satisfied with the programs and community services provided? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Periodically - Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribute to programs sample customer satisfaction surveys. Require programs to report on the results of such surveys in their annual report. - Encourage programs to establish advisory councils & sponsor periodic public meetings and focus groups for key stakeholders

³ Programs are required to set annual objectives for community strengthening activities which we will attempt to aggregate .

⁴ The Corporation is required to report this information annually to Congress. Areas include economically and environmentally distressed areas, areas affected by reductions in defense spending, areas that suffer economic loss as a result of the management of federal lands, and those with an unemployment rate high than the national average.

Objective One: Assessing the value of national service programs (continued)

PARTICIPANTS⁵

Question to be Answered	Timing	Strategy for Obtaining Information
INFORMATION ON IMPACTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does participation in national service programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase participants' sense of civic responsibility?⁶ - enhance participants' education?⁷ - enhance participants' life skills? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually - Years 1 and 2 - Longitudinally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Evaluation Data System (see plans and perceived benefits questions on participant exit form, Appendix B) - Note changes through interviews and focus groups - Sponsor Journal Project - Compare participants and similar group not enrolled in service program (comparison group study) - Conduct survey of alumni
DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the demographic characteristics of participants?⁸ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Evaluation Data System (participant enrollment form)
INFORMATION ON SATISFACTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are participants with their experience? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually - Periodically - Years 1 and 2 - Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use Evaluation Data System (participant exit form) - Encourage the use of participant satisfaction surveys, by developing samples and distributing them to programs. Require programs to report on the results of such surveys in their annual report. - Sponsor Journal Project - Encourage programs to establish participant advisory councils, sponsor focus groups, etc.

⁵ Programs are required to set participant development objectives, which we will attempt to aggregate.

⁶ Required by statute

⁷ Required by statute

⁸ The Corporation is required to report this information to Congress annually.

Objective Two: Providing information on effective practices in support of program improvement and policy decisions.

Question to be Answered	Timing	Strategy for Obtaining Information
IDENTIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What practices contribute to effective program startup? • What practices contribute to successful program results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage programs to collect and share information on good practices - Develop a handbook on continuous program improvement mechanisms - Sponsor participant ethnographer grant (A.Corps, High. Ed.) - Sponsor effective practice studies - Deploy Rapid Feedback Team when quick turn-around is required - Use Electronic Highway to exchange info on good practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the Corporation improve its operations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annually - Ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer Satisfaction Survey (internal and external) - Use Electronic Highway, newsletters, etc. to share good practice/suggestions
STUDIES REQUIRED BY STATUTE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are some program models more cost effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By January 1996 (for reauthorization) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform cost effectiveness analysis - Analyze accomplishments by program and by program type
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do national service programs impact the recruiting of other programs or the military (by state)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By January 1996 (for reauthorization) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct surveys/interviews with participants and military enlistees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the living allowances paid by AmeriCorps and Youth and Conservation Corps programs and do living allowance amounts affect the ability to serve? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By January 1996 (for reauthorization) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct sample survey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What impact are national service programs having on human education, environmental, or public safety needs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summarize results from community impact studies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How should the Corporation define and measure the outcomes of both stipended and nonstipended service programs ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform policy study. Specifics to be determined by policy study team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should AmeriCorps and NCCC programs focus on economically disadvantaged individuals or at risk youth, or include a mix of individuals, including individuals from middle and upper income families? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform policy study. Specifics to be determined by policy study team

Objective Two: Providing information on effective practices (continued)

Question to be Answered	Timing	Strategy for Obtaining Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How import are stipends and educational benefits in achieving desired outcomes in the service programs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform policy study. Specifics to be determined by policy study team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the potential for cost savings and coordination of support and oversight from combining functions performed by ACTION state offices and State Commissions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform policy study. Specifics to be determined by policy study team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What national service and domestic volunteer service programs exist and what is the potential for future consolidation and/or reorganization? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform policy study. Specifics to be determined by policy study team
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications of the June 30, 1995, studies on authorized funding levels (as appropriate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perform cost analysis as appropriate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can residential programs increase the public's support for national and community service? (NCCC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be determined
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the NCCC expand the opportunities for young people to perform community service while increasing their civic responsibility? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be determined
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the capacity of current and former members of the Armed Forces to direct and train NCCC participants? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be determined
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is national service an option to military service in a time of reduced opportunity to serve in the Armed Forces? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report to Congress due on June 30, 1995 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To be determined

IV - INFORMATION GATHERING STRATEGIES: HOW WE PROPOSE TO GET ANSWERS

As reflected in the previous matrix, we intend to put in place a rich mix of evaluation methods, both quantitative and qualitative. The following section describes in more detail the specific methods we intend to use in answering our evaluation questions. Many of the methods we propose serve more than one purpose and will contribute to answering more than one question. In the interest of brevity, however, we discuss each method only once in the section where it plays the largest role.

Information on Impacts

Annual Program Accomplishment Survey. As part of their application, individual AmeriCorps and Higher Education programs are required to specify challenging yet realistic annual objectives for each of the four service areas in which they intend to work. During the year, programs will continually refine these objectives and report on their progress toward them. At the end of the year, programs will report on their success at reaching these objectives, as well as other major program accomplishments.

The vehicle for reporting these accomplishments will be the Annual Accomplishments Survey. Drawing from the best of the Abt and Action summer of safety surveys, we will design a survey to collect data on the specific work programs perform. The survey will collect information on accomplishments in a consistent format so that we can aggregate it. It is important to note that this task will not be a simple one. We will have over 300 programs in operation, providing a wide variety of services. We will need to spend a substantial amount of time working with grantees, especially during the first year, both in the design and execution of this survey.

Comparison Group Studies. By statute we are required to perform these types of studies "where appropriate" to gauge participant impacts. In keeping with this requirement, we propose to carry out a long-term, panel study of service participants. Through this study, we will select a sample of participants to interview at the beginning and at the end of their term of service. We will interview them again at regular intervals over the course of several years. We will also select to interview a group of non-participants who resemble the participants. At the end of the program year, and periodically over time, we will compare the two groups to identify the impact of service participation on behaviors and values.

We also propose to use these types of studies, where appropriate, to measure the impact of our programs on service recipients. How have program beneficiaries changed as a result of our services? How are they different from an otherwise similar group who did not receive services? We will perform representative comparison group studies in each of the four service areas.

Surveys. Surveys are a relatively inexpensive way of collecting a great deal of information. Surveys are also a powerful evaluation tool because if a representative sample of respondents is selected, conclusions about a wider population can be drawn from the data generated. We propose to make use of surveys when studying a variety of things, most notably institutional impacts.

Interviews and Focus Groups. We will conduct one-on-one or small group discussions to produce information which can not be collected through surveys or regular program reports. We will use these techniques to gauge the impact of our programs on involved institutions (e.g., Have our programs influenced the education curriculum of involved school districts? Have our programs changed the way private sector partners think about their role in their community?). Through a series of pre- and post- interviews/focus groups, we will also try to assess whether our programs foster increased collaborations among community organizations.

Cost-benefit Analysis. We will estimate the benefits of programs and the costs of programs, wherever possible in dollars, and then compare benefits to costs. We will perform cost-benefit analyses on our programs as appropriate, recognizing that many of the benefits of community service can not be quantified in terms of dollars.

National Polling. One of the primary purposes the National and Community Service Trust Act is to renew an ethic of service across the country. Through the purchase of questions in already established national polls, we propose to study over a period of years the nation's attitudes toward communities and service. We will also test the public's awareness of service opportunities, particularly our national service programs. While we do not expect major shifts in attitudes from year to year, we do hope to see notable changes over the course of several years.

The Film Project. Because visual documentation is a powerful way of demonstrating impacts, we will produce a documentary describing our programs and the work they do. Similarly, we intend to encourage local programs to photographically document their accomplishments, by giving every program funds in their grant to cover the cost of a camera and video camera.

The Journal Project. Measuring and assigning changes in our participants will be a challenging task. One way to address this challenge is to allow participants to tell their own stories. We propose to contract with a professional, qualitative researcher to create an account of participant experiences based on participant journals. The analyst would abstract themes and identify patterns of experience to illustrate both typical and atypical service years. The final product would be both objective and entertaining.

Descriptive Information

The Evaluation Data System. The Evaluation Data System (EDS) will contain information on both programs and participants. Basic program information will be collected during the grant negotiation stage. Participant data will be collected for AmeriCorps programs through Participant Enrollment and Exit Forms. Because we are not required by statute to collect individual demographic data on Learn and Serve programs we will collect only aggregated participant data from them. The EDS will also link to other parts of the overall Management Information System (Appendix B contains sample data collection instruments).

Information on Satisfaction

Local Satisfaction Surveys. By regulation local programs are required to collect meaningful measures of customer satisfaction, where "customers" include direct beneficiaries, community members, partners and the like. To support this effort, the Corporation will provide

example customer surveys which programs can adapt as they see fit. During site visits program officers will review the results of customer satisfaction efforts. Programs will also be required to submit summaries of these efforts in their periodic reports to their program officer.

Other Local Feedback Mechanisms. Maintaining contact and an ongoing dialogue with stakeholders is a critical element of ensuring "customer" satisfaction. With this in mind, we will encourage local programs to establish advisory councils and sponsor periodic public meetings and focus groups for key stakeholders.

Satisfaction Surveys of Corporation Customers. In order to be responsive to our customers and improve the quality of the services we provide, we envision surveying all direct grantees and State Commissions, as well as samples of participants and community representatives each year.

Information on Effective Practices (Continuous Improvement)

Continuous Improvement Handbook. The ultimate responsibility for quality and continuous improvement belongs to local programs. Programs are required through the regulations to monitor the quality of their services, the satisfaction of "customers", and management effectiveness. They are also required to track progress towards annual objectives. These efforts are to be ongoing allowing for frequent feedback and the quick correction of weaknesses. To facilitate this ongoing assessment the Corporation is developing a handbook which will provide information on continuous program improvement methods.

Effective Practice Sharing. We plan to bring a consultant on-board to help design creative approaches to identifying and evaluating effective practices. This consultant will also work with the Technical Assistance team to put in place mechanisms that facilitate the sharing of good practices and effective monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Participant Observers/Ethnographers. Ethnography relies on frequent, extended observations of local program observations by trained researchers. The strength of ethnography is that it is based not on brief visits or knowledge obtained from interviews, but rather it is based on the first-hand experience of the researcher. It is important to note that ethnography is bound by strict ethical standards designed to protect the confidentiality of individuals providing information. The goal is to understand program reality through frequent contact with participants and others. In doing so, the establishment of trust and rapport is essential.

We propose establishing a grant program to enroll graduate student "observers" in a sample of local AmeriCorps and Higher Education programs with one of their primary objectives being the identifying of good practices and common program challenges. These student observers will only be placed in programs that agree to host them. They will have common training and will meet periodically to share what they have learned. A final report summarizing findings and recommending actions will be produced and shared with programs and State Commissions.

Rapid Feedback Teams. Periodically throughout the year we expect questions to arise that we cannot readily answer without additional analysis or information collection. To respond to these questions, we propose using rapid feedback teams to collect or verify data, or to evaluate and

report on programs of particular interest. These teams will not perform investigative functions better suited to teams operating under the cognizance of senior management or the inspector general, nor will they perform program management functions.

Effective Practices Sharing via the Electronic Highway. The Corporation has distinguished itself as one of the first federally funded entity to place a notice of proposed rule making on the Internet for comment. This is just one example of the use of on-line communication. Bulletin boards, conferences, and electronic mail are other examples of how on-line communications can facilitate information sharing that, in turn, will facilitate program improvement.

Cost-effectiveness Studies The Act requires that the Corporation investigate the cost-effectiveness of various program models. Through cost-effectiveness analysis we will assess the performance of programs in meeting their goals in relation to the costs. We can then compare the results of this type of analysis across similar programs to indicate which programs are achieving better efficiencies.

Policy Study Teams. We propose that the Corporation create policy teams to study and prepare reports on policy questions. Teams should be drawn from various offices in the Corporation including Legislative Affairs, the subtitle offices, and the Office of the Chief Executive. Program and state representatives should also be included. These teams should operate under the direction of the Corporation's Managing Director. The costs of these policy studies have not been included in the evaluation budget.

V - PRODUCTS AND SYSTEMS THAT COMMUNICATE THE ANSWERS

The information we learn through our research methods will be packaged in many different ways. Each single research technique will find several outlets. The formats for presenting our information will vary with the needs of our many constituencies: Congress, Corporate leadership, Corporation Program Officers, State Commissions, grantees and sub-grantees, participants, applicants, donors, and the American public. Essentially, we have four categories of products:

- * Interim Information for Corporate Leadership and Staff
- * Reports to Congress
- * Program Evaluation Reports
- * Reports to States

Interim Information for Corporate Leadership and Staff

One of the most common criticisms of evaluation efforts is that the information comes too late to be of any utility to decision makers. The evaluation systems of the Corporation must find ways to overcome this tendency. We must support ways to get information to the Corporation's leadership that is timely, accurate, and useful (as our mission statement demands).

Meetings with Hill and OMB Staff. Congress and OMB are key Corporation stakeholders with whom we must maintain an open channel of communication. To this end, we have already held the first in what will be a series of meetings with Hill and OMB staff on evaluation activities. We do not want to wait until appropriation or budget hearings are held to know what these important stakeholders want of us.

Program Accomplishment and Customer Satisfaction Reports. In support of the Corporation's annual report, we will produce regular reports on Program Accomplishments and Customer Satisfaction Reports, in addition to the demographics report required by Congress. These reports will contain the detail behind the information reported in the annual report to Congress.

Teleconferences. At any given time, the Corporation may have several evaluators in the field actively studying first hand the operations and activities of our local programs. We propose to hold periodic teleconferences with these researchers. In these conferences we would gather first hand, fresh impressions of program needs, problems, and accomplishments. These conferences could be attended by corporate leaders, program staff or we could issue summaries of their contents.

Periodic Data Base Reports. The Evaluation Data System will generate periodic reports. These reports will contain basic data on program levels, renewals, participant enrollments and terminations, demographic characteristics, and so on.

Interim Reporting Requirements in Grants and Contracts. Every research grant and contract will have interim reporting requirements built in. On multi-year contracts, these reports should be at least every year. On one-year contracts, the interim reports should be at least

quarterly. These reports would summarize what has been learned to date. This could include early warnings on program difficulties and recommendations for program improvement.

Electronic Highway. This may be our quickest path to information on challenges and issues confronting participants and programs. This information will come through various bulletin boards and other on-line links to the field.

Reports to Congress

There are four Congressional reporting requirements.

Corporation's Annual Report to Congress, due before February 1. The Act requires the Corporation to submit an annual report to Congress with the first one due before February 1, 1995. This report must, among other requirements, provide information on the results achieved by our programs. The annual report must also include the findings and actions taken as a result of evaluations done by the Corporation that year, so it could include data from the Evaluation Data System, the Program Accomplishments Survey, Customer Satisfaction Surveys, and other evaluation studies. It is important to note that the first annual report will not contain substantial information on program accomplishments since this report is due before our first program year is over.

Annual Demographics Report on National Service Participants and Communities, due on March 21. At a minimum, we must file reports for AmeriCorps and NCCC every year on the demographics of participants and the funding to distressed areas. The Act actually requires reports on aid to distressed areas on two dates: before March 21 (18 months after enactment) and on June 30. In the first year, we can report twice if required, but it will be annual after that.

Policy Issues Report, due June 30, 1995. The Act requires that the Corporation carry out evaluation studies on the administration and organization of national service programs. These programs include AmeriCorps, the National Civilian Community Corps, and VISTA. The issues the Corporation must cover include: meeting needs, getting results, cost-effectiveness, funding, the merger of ACTION and ONS, and others (see matrix in section IV).

Policy Issues Report on NCCC, due June 30, 1995. Due at the same time are the answers to a second set of broad policy questions specifically addressing the National Civilian Community Corps. Topics include: public support for national service, expanded opportunities for youth, potential uses for former military members, and the role of community service as an option to military service.

Program Evaluation Reports

Subtitle Evaluation Reports. These reports will describe program and participant characteristics, activities, accomplishments, strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations by subtitle. Subtitle reports will also include information on what is already known about a subtitle (e.g., summaries of previous studies).

Issue Reports. Where appropriate, we intend to prepare evaluation reports that focus on cross-cutting issues. These reports would cover topics or problems that are shared by more than one subtitle. For example, we might report on the impact of national service programs on public safety. These issue reports would in all likelihood be more analytic and be aimed at a national program leadership and policy makers.

Film Documentaries and Journal Reports. We will also produce less traditional types of reports in the form of videos and still photography. These visual and narrative reports would serve to complement and support the more technical and traditional reporting devices.

Reports to States and Grantees

Individual State Reports. We propose that the Corporation produce a series of annual, 2-4 page reports tailored to each State (organized by Congressional district if appropriate) that highlight activities and accomplishments.

Such reports might include:

- * funding by subtitle in the State
- * numbers and characteristics of participants
- * program results for the State
- * customer satisfaction levels within the State
- * vignettes that profile successful programs and participants
- * common challenges and program recommendations

Newsletter. We intend to communicate with the field through either an evaluation newsletter or an evaluation section in the Corporation's newsletter. Through this vehicle we plan to keep grantees, subgrantees and other interested parties up to date on evaluation activities. We will also use newsletters to disseminate evaluation findings as appropriate.

Best Practices Reports. In concert with the Technical Assistance team and the field, we will prepare reports on effective (and ineffective) practices. These reports will be designed to provide useful information and recommendations for program improvement.

VI - PARTNERSHIPS

Partnering with Grantees and States

The Corporation's overall evaluation strategy builds on the respective strengths of programs, states, and the Corporation. The Corporation has the resources available to evaluate, in-depth, the impact of National Service. Our studies will build on individual program and state data, and will draw conclusions that are possible only from a larger sampling and larger perspective. We believe that evaluation at the state and local level should be used as a management tool that helps program continuously improve. Consequently, programs and states are not required to perform independent or in-depth impact evaluations. Instead, they are required to set up methods for continuously assessing performance.

They are also required to establish and track meaningful annual objectives (consistent with their mission statement). The Corporation will invest in quality programs which get things done. Striving to meet demonstrable objectives must be an important task of every program. However, the Corporation does not want grantees to focus exclusively on meeting objectives at the expense of quality service delivery. Just as important as meeting objectives is the learning that takes place along the way. We acknowledge that objectives may be refined over the course of the year, and we recognize that accountability must be balanced with flexibility.

In order to ensure this evaluation approach is successful, the Corporation must partner with our grantees. Traditionally, evaluation units in government have been regarded by grantees as adversaries rather than partners. The relationship we envision is more closely akin to a consultative relationship, with evaluation processes providing objective information and, as appropriate, recommendations, in a time frame and in a way that grantees will find useful. In this sense our relationship with grantees will be a client service relationship. All information requests that require input from subgrantees will be discussed with grantees in coordination with our program staff. Our goal in serving our grantees is to make them as self-sufficient as possible in assessing and improving the performance of their subgrantees. At the same time, we will minimize the burden of data aggregation where this task is mechanical and there is little to be learned from the process. Finally, we will provide training and technical assistance in formulating objectives and developing tailored strategies for performing continuous assessment.

In turn, we expect State Commissions and other grantees to:

- * Set clear and specific annual objectives that define the results they will achieve.
- * Select subgrantees with strong mission statements and meaningful annual objectives.
- * Fulfill our requests for information regarding their own and subgrantee results within the required time frames.
- * Ensure their subgrantees submit complete and accurate data as requested.
- * Work with the Corporation in identifying useful evaluations, designing questions and studies, and improving the ways we communicate information back to them.

Partnering with Program Staff

This plan's focus on continuous program improvement is a significant change in emphasis from previous evaluation approaches taken in ACTION and the former Commission on National and Community Service. Our intent is to work closely with the program staff. Specifically, we see our working relationship guided by four principles:

- * We will never seek information from or visit a program or State without discussing our plans with the appropriate program officer well in advance to make sure our plans do not conflict with other activities.
- * We will rely on program officers to facilitate these activities and to help ensure their States or programs meet requested deadlines.
- * We will confer with program officers in selecting programs for special studies.
- * We will work with program staff in determining evaluation priorities and in designing evaluation questions and studies.

These principles do not conflict with the legislated requirement that the Corporation's evaluations be conducted by persons independent of program operation. Rather, they enhance the ultimate usefulness of evaluation, while building on the premise of evaluation's independence.

In sum, while evaluation activities and reporting must be independent of programs, there will always be a close advisory relationship between program staff and evaluators.

Partnering with the Technical Assistance Team

To ensure evaluation findings contribute to continuous program improvement efforts, the link between technical assistance and evaluation must be a strong one. In order to forge such a link we must:

- * Ensure evaluation results are clearly communicated to the technical assistance team.
- * Ensure technical assistance representatives are included in evaluation design work.
- * Design evaluations that link outcomes to effective practices and that identify common program challenges.

Technical assistance plays a critical role in ensuring evaluation results are used to improve program quality. They also have a critical role to play in providing technical assistance on evaluation. We have put in place an outcome based evaluation system. The evaluation of individual programs centers around their success in achieving direct and demonstrable results. To ensure this outcome based evaluation is successful, programs, states, and Corporation staff will need to be trained on how to set realistic, demonstrable outcome objectives. Similarly, many programs and states will need assistance in designing tailored evaluation techniques they can use during the year to improve quality and measure results.

We will work with the Technical Assistance team to create a pool of experts who are available to provide assistance on setting objectives and designing tailored local evaluation strategies. This pool of evaluators should be available by May so that assistance can be provided before program start-up.

VII - IMPLEMENTATION

PERSONNEL

As we implement our evaluation strategy, we face a key issue: how can the work get done given the ambitious program and limited staffing? In answer to this challenge, we propose that staffing resources be augmented through the following approaches:

Corporation Staff:

Evaluation Staff Resources. The Office of National and Community Service Programs needs to fill the two remaining evaluation slots. The evaluation budget for the Office of National and Community Service programs is \$5 million in FY 94 and \$7 million (proposed) in FY 95. With these funds the evaluation staff will carry out the evaluation of a portfolio of program funds that total \$414 million - \$240 million.

Program Office Data Specialists. This proposed evaluation system is built on a data base foundation. With this in mind, we propose that the Corporation formally identify in each program office one person who will be responsible for the data needs of that program. This data specialist will be the liaison to evaluation and MIS systems in the Corporation. They will be an important part of maintaining the integrity and utility of the data bases. This person will also be able to do program specific analyses, on demand, for their program area.

Personnel on Loan to the Corporation:

Inter-agency Personnel Agreements. Interagency personnel agreements (IPAs) are one way to increase personnel without violating FTE constraints. The Corporation can recruit for limited periods of time (one year is common in many federal agencies) personnel from outside the government. We reimburse the source and promise that the person on loan will not be offered a permanent position.

Details. A second way to increase resources, at least temporarily, is to borrow staff from other agencies. One area where this might be of particular value is in the area of contracting. We propose to borrow, on reimbursable detail, a specialist in contract development. This person would help us draft our statements of work and requests for proposals.

Presidential Management Interns. Presidential Management Interns (PMIs) are graduates of masters degree programs who intern for two year with Federal agencies. PMIs can rotate for up to a year in agencies other than the one that sponsors them. PMIs do not count against FTEs and, during a rotation, the sponsoring agency continues to pay the PMI's salary.

Evaluation Sounding Board

We propose that the Corporation form a sounding board, representing a range of viewpoints, to provide feedback on evaluation activities within the Corporation. This board should

represent the views of various stakeholders and provide a broad range of input to Corporation staff responsible for program evaluation.

The Evaluation Sounding Board should have eight members, including:

- * Two individuals with significant and current experience in the operation of direct service programs (when there is no conflict of interest).
- * Two individuals with experience in coordinating or directing service programs at the state or regional level (when there is no conflict of interest).
- * Two staff members from the Corporation with responsibilities for grant-making or program operations.
- * One evaluation professionals from other agencies of the federal government.
- * One evaluation professional from outside of government.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

The Act permits the Corporation to fund evaluations through grants and contracts. While there are many technical distinctions between these vehicles, two major ones exist for evaluation purposes. One is that grants are more open and independent of our control than are contracts. The second is that grants must be made in the interest of serving the general public, while contracts serve the interest of the federal government.

Grants

With grants, we have a substantial amount of discretion in selecting evaluators. For instance, we may identify an educational institution or non-profit organization that has a valuable expertise that we want to access. At the same time, grantees often operate relatively independent of our influence, and quality control is more difficult than is the case with contracts.

Contracts

Fixed-Fee Contracts. In the area of contracting, our choices are basically between fixed-fee and cost-reimbursement contracts. Where we can draw fairly tight parameters around a service or product, it is to our benefit to enter into a fixed-fee contract. This is the type of contract used to purchase supplies, for example. In our systems, a fixed-fee contract might be most appropriate for a limited task like the implementation and management of data collection for the Evaluation Data System. We know the fields and can estimate the number of units, thus enabling us to reimburse on a fixed unit-cost basis.

Cost-reimbursement Contracts. In most cases, however, because of the uncertainty of the work involved and the demands for creativity, innovation, and flexibility, evaluation contracts will fall into the cost-reimbursement category. In these contracts payment is made based on the costs actually incurred. We propose awarding several contracts (under one solicitation) to perform impact evaluations. Depending on the quality of the contract proposals we receive, we envision awarding at least one contract for subtitle B impact evaluations and another contract for subtitle C impact evaluations. These contracts will be designed to provide interim impact data based on work done our first program year, and longitudinal impact data based on work performed over several years.

Task Order Contracts. For the bulk of the remaining evaluation studies (primarily effective practice studies), we recommend the use of task order contracts, sometimes known as indefinite quantity contracts. Having task order contracts in place will allow us to purchase evaluation support on an as needed basis without having to compete each purchase. We recommend that the Corporation enter into more than one, but not more than three task order contracts in support of our major programming areas. These contracts would be for one year and renewable for three additional years. Each offeror would have to demonstrate organizational capabilities in the range of information gathering methods proposed in Section IV of this plan.

Consultants

Consultants are best used when the work involved is small in scale or not yet clearly defined. We have identified several projects suitable for consulting contracts, primarily involving planning and design work.

The following tables summarize our recommendations on funding vehicles and budget amounts for each of the information gathering techniques described in section IV.

Information Gathering Techniques and Funding Mechanisms

(Marks Have Been Removed - Contract Sensitive Information)

	VEHICLE FOR PERFORMING WORK:					
	Grants - Competitive?		Contracts			Consultants
	Yes	No	Fixed-Fee	Cost-Reimb.	Task Order	
Information on Impacts						
Community Impacts (including annual accomplishments survey)						
Participant Impacts (including panel study)						
National Polling						
The Film Project						
The Journal Project						
Descriptive Information						
Evaluation Data System						
Information on Satisfaction						
Satisfaction Survey of Corp. Grantees						
Information on Effective Practices						
Subtitle specific effective practice questions						
Continuous Improvement Handbooks						
Effective Practice Sharing						
Participant Observers						
Rapid Feedback Capability						
Network on Electronic Highway						
Cost-effectiveness Studies						
Policy Study Teams						

Numbers Removed - Contract Sensitive Information

Funding Requirements for Evaluation FY 94 and FY 95		
Evaluation Component	Fiscal Years	
	1994	1995
Community Impact Contracts (including Accomplishment Survey)		
Participant Impact Contracts (including participant panel study)		
Task Order Contracts		
National Polling		
Film Project		
Journal Project		
Evaluation Data System		
Program Quality Handbook		
Consultant Hires		
Fellows Program		
IPA's		
Summers of Service		
Abt Contract		
Staff Training		
Staff Travel		
Contingencies/State Evaluations		
Total		

TIMELINE
(Removed - Contains Contract Sensitive Information)

TECHNICAL APPENDICES

APPENDIX A LEGISLATED EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

The National and Community Service Trust Act (NCSTA) of 1993 contains a complex set of evaluation standards on the Corporation. These standards come in the form of amendments to the preexisting, national service acts: the Domestic Volunteer Service Act (DVSA) of 1973 and the National and Community Service Act of 1990. We analyzed the legislation in detail. First, we listed all the citations in the NCSTA on evaluation. We then developed matrices that plot the requirements by section and subtitle. We next organized the requirements by level of applicability, from a level that includes all subtitles under both laws to subtitle specific requirements. In general, the amendments set standards for how the Corporation is to carry out evaluations, what we are to evaluate, when we must report the results, and how evaluations are to be funded.

1. How Evaluations Are To Be Carried Out.

The NCSTA contains guidance on how we are to evaluate. These requirements cover all Corporation subtitles, under both the DVSA and the NCSA.

The NCSTA requires that evaluations in the Corporation will be:

- continuous.
- comparative.
- conducted by persons not directly involved in program administration.
- governed by published standards for evaluation that the Corporation must set.
- governed by appropriate OMB circulars.

The act also lays out some standards on the relationship between the Corporation, states, programs, and participants:

- evaluations must seek the opinions of participants and community members on the strengths and weaknesses of programs.
- States, programs, and participants must provide any information that the Corporation believes is necessary for evaluation.
- Evaluations must protect individual confidentiality . If individuals give written consent, we may disclose personal information. Corporation may disclose aggregate information.
- The Corporation will provided training and technical assistance to applicants and grantees to enable them to carry out evaluations appropriate to their level of activity.

Some aspects of the law give the Corporation permission to engage in activities that would enhance the evaluation mission:

- funding may be through grants or contracts.
- the CEO may appoint advisory committees to advise the Board on national service issues, including the evaluation of programs.

- the Corporation may support research and evaluation on national service, including service learning.

2. What Is To Be Evaluated

This aspect of the law is complex. There are requirements that apply to all subtitles in both acts, some to two subtitles, and some to only one of the sub-titles. In addition, there are two levels of evaluation research implicit in the legislation: program evaluation issues and national policy questions.

National Policy Questions

The law requires that the Corporation carry out evaluation studies on the administration and organization of national service programs. These programs include Subtitles C (AmeriCorps Grants), Subtitle E (the National Civilian Community Corps), and VISTA. The issues the Corporation must cover include:

- the degree to which our programs help answer unmet human, education, environmental, and public safety needs.
- how to measure educational and other program results.
- the appropriate mix of income-levels among national service participants.
- the role and importance of stipends and educational benefits.
- the potential for cost savings and coordination of support by combining ACTION State Offices and State Commissions.
- the implications of studies and demonstrations for authorized funding levels.
- the number, potential consolidation, and future organization of national service programs, including VISTA, subtitle C and others.
- other issues that the CEO thinks are important.

A report on these questions is due to Congress by June 30, 1995.

A second set of broad, policy questions specifically address the National Civilian Community Corps:

- the degree to which residential programs can increase support for national and community service by the people of the United States.
- the success of the CCC in expanding the opportunities for young people to do community service while building their own skills and increasing their civic responsibility to the country.
- the capacity of current and former members of the Armed Forces to direct and train participants in the CCC.
- the degree to which domestic, national service is an option to military service for young people in a time of reduced opportunity to serve in the Armed Forces.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation is responsible for answering these questions. Unlike the other set of policy questions, there is no deadline for any report on these questions.

Program Evaluation Issues

The act provides some guidance on the content of evaluations for all programs. Subtitles C and E receive more specific direction.

All Programs. The law requires that evaluations be conducted on all programs. These studies must include:

- the study of impacts.
- the determination of effectiveness of program models in meeting goals and cost of doing so.
- the structure and mechanisms for delivery of services for such programs.

Additional, general responsibilities of the Corporation include setting up measurable performance goals for all programs.

Subtitles C and E. An evaluation of Subtitles C (AmeriCorps Grants) and E (National Civilian Community Corps) must cover, first, the demographic characteristics of participants, for each State. These demographic characteristics are "sex, age, economic background, education level, ethnic group, disability classification, and geographic region."

In addition, the evaluation must determine annual funding to:

- communities with "high concentrations of low-income people" (includes empowerment zones).
- environmentally distressed areas;
- areas adversely changed by Federal action related to the management of Federal lands;
- "areas adversely affected by reductions in defense spending";
- areas with high unemployment.

The law places a major emphasis on program effectiveness in Subtitles C and E for these issues:

- diversity of participants.
- promoting educational achievement.
- influencing participants to further public and community service through careers, service in other programs, military and part-time volunteer service.
- promoting positive attitudes on the impact of service and on civic responsibility.
- reduction in higher education loan burden.
- providing benefits to communities.
- providing aid to community agencies without being a burden.
- not supplanting or displacing existing workers.
- attracting citizens to public service, including armed forces, VISTA, and the Peace Corps.

Subtitle C and I. The act requires evaluations by the Corporation of AmeriCorps grants programs and the American Conservation Youth Corps to determine:

- living allowances paid in programs
- effect of allowances on individuals' ability to participate in the programs.

Subtitle C Only. The legislation calls for evaluations of Subtitle C to determine the following:

- impact on recruitment, for each State, by ACTION programs, Armed Forces, and the Peace Corps.
- levels of economically disadvantaged youth.
- income levels of all participants.
- the amount of aid provided to distressed areas.

ACTION Programs. The Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (as amended) requires that the Director have each program evaluated every three years. These evaluations must cover:

- the impact of all programs.
- their effectiveness in meeting stated goals.
- cost-effectiveness.
- impact on related programs.
- the structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services.

3. When Evaluations Are To Be Reported

Reports to Congress. The legislation sets four reporting requirements. Two refer to one-time only reports due June 30, 1995:

The **first** report covers the issues identified above as national policy issues for all programs and those policy issues on the National Civilian Community Corps.

The **second** report due on June 30, 1995, covers an "evaluation of success of investment in national service":

- the levels in Subtitle C of participating, economically disadvantaged youth;
- the total income of each participant in Subtitle C programs;
- assistance for distressed areas.

Two reports are required annually. The first report that must be submitted annually is a general report from the Corporation to Congress, due within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year. This report covers:

- what the States report in their annual report to the Corporation.
- findings and actions taken as a result of evaluations done by the Corporation.
- information on the results achieved by the programs funded by this Act during the year preceding the year in which the Corporation prepares the report.

The second report the Corporation must submit annually focuses on the demographics of national service participants and distressed areas. The Act specifies that a report is due to Congress from the "entity conducting the evaluation" to "the President, Congress, the Corporation, and each State Commission." We must submit this report 18 months after the first

day of the year covered by the evaluation. At a minimum, we must file reports for Subtitles C and E every year on:

- the demographics of participants.
- the funding to distressed areas.

The law is not requiring that we study all issues every year. The Corporation may set the time frames for studying the remaining (non-demographic) program evaluation issues. The Corporation must report, however, the findings of any completed evaluation studies as part of the annual report to Congress.

In sum, there are three dates for four reports to Congress:

- results of the study of the national policy issues on June 30, 1995.
- summary of participant income data and distressed areas served, due on June 30, 1995.
- the Corporation's annual report to Congress within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year.
- 18 months after the first day of the year covered by an evaluation of the demographics of participants and communities involved in national service programs.

Other Reporting Requirements. The DVSA requires that the Director of ACTION "publish summaries of the results of evaluations of program and project impact and effectiveness no later than 60 days" after the evaluations are completed.

4. Funding for Evaluation.

The funding for evaluation comes from two sources. These are the separate appropriations for National and Community Service Act activities and Domestic Volunteer Service Act activities. NCSA appropriations are a separate funded activity in the President's budget. For FY 1994, \$ 5 million has been appropriated and the proposed budget for FY 1995 is \$ 7 million.

DVSA programs are funded, not as a separate line item. Instead, within the DVSA, the Director is authorized to spend no more than one per cent of the funds appropriated under the act. For FY 1994, one percent of appropriations would be \$ 2 million. In FY 1995, the maximum permitted for evaluation would be \$ 2.4 million.

LOCAL PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

DRAFT

I. Identification

Grantee: _____

Sub-grantee/Program Name: _____ Sub-grantee ID: _____

Program Director: _____

Telephone:

(1) (____) _____ - _____

(2) (____) _____ - _____

Fax:

(____) _____ - _____

Address:

Street _____

City _____

State _____

Zip _____

County _____

Congressional District _____

E-Mail _____

Program date of operations this grant period: From _____ thru _____

II. Annual Objectives

Getting things done (direct services to be provided):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Participant Development:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Community Strengthening

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

III. Program Description

DRAFT

IV. Primary Partners, Other Participating Agencies, Organizations, Businesses

Partners

Print full name of organization here:

Type of Organization (CIRCLE ONE)

- 1 = Business
- 2 = Community-based organization/
Non-profit
- 3 = Federal Government
- 4 = State/local Government
- 5 = Educational institution
- 6 = Other (SPECIFY FOR EACH:)

	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
	1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____

Funders

**Funding
Amount**

CNCS		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____
		1 2 3 4 5 6 Other: _____

V. Basic Description (All programs complete)

1. Administering Organization (*check one*)
 - ☐ Local Government
 - ☐ State Government
 - ☐ Indian Tribe/Tribal Government
 - ☐ Community Organization/Private Non-Profit
 - ☐ Elementary/Secondary Educational Organization
 - ☐ Post-Secondary Educational Organization
 - ☐ Other
(Specify: _____)
2. Program Structure (*check all that apply*)
 - ☐ Urban
 - ☐ Rural
 - ☐ Suburban
 - ☐ Residential
 - ☐ Non-Residential
 - ☐ Individual-Based
 - ☐ Team-Based (club, crew)
 - ☐ Other (multiple Corps, multiple States)
(Specify: _____)
3. Who are the primary beneficiaries of the community service you provide? (*Check all that apply*)
 - ☐ Pre-School Children
 - ☐ Students K-12
 - ☐ Students, College
 - ☐ Young Adults
 - ☐ Senior Citizens
 - ☐ General Public
(Continued in next column)
- ☐ Community-Wide Impact
 - ☐ Economically Disadvantaged
 - ☐ Educationally Disadvantaged
 - ☐ Disable/Physically Challenged Persons
 - ☐ Homeless, Low-Income Housing Residents
 - ☐ Unemployed
 - ☐ At-Risk Youth
 - ☐ Particular Ethnic Groups
 - ☐ Immigrants, Refugees
 - ☐ Migrant Workers
 - ☐ Patients/Residents in Hospitals, Nursing Homes, Hospices, Other Long-Term Care Facilities
 - ☐ Substance-Dependent Individuals
 - ☐ Outdoor Recreationists/Environmentalists/Conservationists
 - ☐ Other
(Specify: _____)
 - ☐ Other
(Specify: _____)
4. Planned Number of Participants:
 - _____ full-time
 - _____ part-time
5. Planned number of paid staff: _____
6. Did program exist prior to this program year?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No

VI. What are the major direct services that you provide? (All Programs Complete)

a. Education

School Readiness

- ☐ Child Care
- ☐ Head Start/ preschool
- ☐ Parent literacy
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

School Success

- ☐ In-class support
- ☐ After School tutoring
- ☐ After School mentoring
- ☐ Service-learning coordinator
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

b. Human Needs

Health

- ☐ Independent living assistance
- ☐ Supporting community health clinics
- ☐ Prenatal care
- ☐ Health care to families or young children
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

Home

- ☐ Shelter support for the homeless
- ☐ Rehabilitating low income-housing
- ☐ Public assistance transition support
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

c. Public Safety

Crime prevention

- ☐ Violence prevention patrols
- ☐ Conflict resolution
- ☐ Reduction of substance abuse
- ☐ After school activities
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

Crime control

- ☐ Community policing
- ☐ Victim assistance
- ☐ Anti-victimization programs
- ☐ Juvenile justice programs
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

d. Environment

Neighborhood Environment

- ☐ Revitalizing neighborhoods
- ☐ Eliminating environmental risks
- ☐ Energy efficiency efforts, recycling
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

Natural Environment

- ☐ Conserving and restoring public lands
- ☐ Trail maintenance
- ☐ Natural resource sampling, mapping, and monitoring
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

e. Other State Priorities

VII. Major services provided for participants (AmeriCorps programs only, check all that apply)

a. Basic Education

- ☐ Basic/ remedial education
- ☐ English as a second language
- ☐ General education development (GED) Preparation
- ☐ Tutoring, other preparatory assistance
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

b. Occupational Education

- ☐ Occupational skills training
- ☐ Work experience, job shadowing, etc.
- ☐ Career awareness, job search skills
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

c. Participant Development

- ☐ Leadership training
- ☐ Self-esteem enhancement
- ☐ Reflection/ group discussions
- ☐ Citizenship education
- ☐ Team Building
- ☐ Mediation Training
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

d. Life Skills

- ☐ Parenting and family management
- ☐ Nutrition
- ☐ Personal health care
- ☐ Personal finances
- ☐ Individual or group counseling
- ☐ Interpersonal skills
- ☐ Substance abuse prevention program
- ☐ Substance abuse treatment program
- ☐ Other (Specify: _____)

VIII. Other Information (Learn and Serve programs only)

- a.** ☐ Higher Education program
(College/University size: _____)
- ☐ K - 12 Program
(School district size: _____)
(School size: _____)

- b. Program Location**
- ☐ School-Based
 - ☐ Community-Based

- c. If School-Based**
- ☐ Public
 - ☐ Private/Parochial

- d. Program Cycle**
- ☐ Academic Year
 - ☐ Semester
 - ☐ Summer
 - ☐ Year Round

e. Program Scope (for K-12 Learn and Serve)

- ☐ District Wide
- ☐ School Wide
- ☐ Grade Wide
- ☐ Class Specific
- ☐ Out of School Youth
- ☐ Specific geographical Area
- ☐ In-Service Education
(Specify: _____)

f. Program Type (for K - 12 Learn and Serve)

- ☐ Volunteer Service
- ☐ Service Learning
- ☐ Service Learning in an academic curriculum
- ☐ Partnership/ Adult volunteer

PARTICIPANT ENROLLMENT FORM

For Program Staff Use:

Grantee: _____

Subgrantee/Program: _____ Subgrantee ID Number _____

Participant's Name: _____
FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL LAST

S.S. #: _____

Date of Enrollment: _____ / _____ / _____
MONTH DAY YEARDate Form Completed: _____ / _____ / _____
MONTH DAY YEAR

Participant's signature: _____ Date _____

Parent's signature: _____ Date _____
(if required)

Please complete the following items:

ParticipantAddress: _____
STREET CITY STATE ZIPParent/Guardian Name: _____
FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL LASTAddress: _____
STREET CITY STATE ZIP

Were you previously enrolled in any other National and Community Service programs?

- ☐ Yes If so, when? _____ / _____ / _____ To _____ / _____ / _____
MONTH DAY YEAR MONTH DAY YEAR
- ☐ No

1. Date of Birth
(use month number. Example: 01/14/1971):
_____/_____/_____
MONTH DAY YEAR
2. Which **one** of the following categories best describes your racial or ethnic origin?
 - a. ☐ White (Non-Hispanic)
 - ☐ African American (Non-Hispanic)
 - ☐ Hispanic/Latino
 - ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander
 - ☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native
3. Are you ...
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
4. Are you a ...
 - ☐ US citizen
 - ☐ Permanent resident (not a US citizen)
 - ☐ Alien/ work permit/ authorized to work
5. Do you have a disability?
 - ☐ Yes (Specify: _____)
 - ☐ No
6. Will your participation in the program be full or part time? (check **one**)
 - ☐ Full time (1700 hours during a period of 9-12 months)
 - ☐ Part Time (900 hours during a period of 2 years or less)
7. How did you hear about this program? (check **all that apply**)
 - ☐ Read about it in the newspaper
 - ☐ Saw a public service announcement
 - ☐ Heard one of the President's speeches on a Call to Service
 - ☐ Recruited by an organization/school
 - ☐ Guidance Counselor/Teacher/Parent/Relative
 - ☐ Friend told me/Friend applied
 - ☐ Heard about on TV/radio
 - ☐ Other (specify: _____)
8. What are the **two major** reasons you decided to join this program?
 - ☐ Friends have joined
 - ☐ Wanted to make new friends
 - ☐ Wanted to learn about or work with different ethnic/ cultural groups
 - ☐ Parents/teacher wanted me to join
 - ☐ To explore future job/educational interests
 - ☐ Interested in health issues
 - ☐ Interested in public safety issues
 - ☐ Interested in education issues
 - ☐ Interested in environmental issues
 - ☐ To help other people/perform a community service
 - ☐ To get an educational scholarship
 - ☐ Wanted to be a part of national movement
 - ☐ Get a job/ earn money
 - ☐ Other (specify: _____)
9. Are you registered to vote?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
10. Are you ... (check **one**)
 - ☐ Single, never married
 - ☐ Married, living with husband or wife
 - ☐ Married, not living with husband or wife/Legally separated
 - ☐ Living in a marriage-like relationship
 - ☐ Widowed or divorced
11. Do you have children?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
12. When you joined the program, were you living with:
 - ☐ Mother
 - ☐ Father
 - ☐ Foster parent(s)
 - ☐ Other female guardian
 - ☐ Other male guardian
 - ☐ Alone
 - ☐ With someone other than relative/legal guardian
 - ☐ None of the above
13. In the last 12 months, how many people, counting yourself, lived in your household? _____
14. Using the "adjusted gross income" figure from last year's federal income tax return what was the total income for your **household** (your parent's/guardian's household if you were claimed as a dependent)? (check **one**)
 - a. ☐ \$0-10,000
 - ☐ \$10,001-20,000
 - ☐ \$20,001-30,000
 - ☐ \$30,001-40,000
 - ☐ \$40,001-50,000
 - ☐ \$50,001-60,000
 - ☐ \$60,001-70,000
 - ☐ \$70,001-80,000
 - ☐ \$80,001-90,000
 - ☐ \$90,001-100,000
 - ☐ Over 100,000
- b. The income reported above is:
 - ☐ Mine
 - ☐ My parent /guardian(s)
15. Do you or does anyone else in your household currently receive... (check **all that apply**)
 - ☐ AFDC
 - ☐ General Assistance/General Relief
 - ☐ FoodStamps
 - ☐ WIC
 - ☐ Workers Compensation
 - ☐ SSI or SSDI
 - ☐ None of the above
16. What is the highest grade or level of education that you have **completed**? (check **one**)
 - ☐ 8th grade or less
 - ☐ 9th, 10th, or 11th grade
 - ☐ GED
 - ☐ 12th grade-High School Diploma
 - ☐ Some education beyond high school
 - ☐ An associate's degree
 - ☐ A bachelor's degree
 - ☐ A master's degree
 - ☐ A doctorate degree

PARTICIPANT EXIT FORM

To be filled out by participant. In cases where the participant has gone and can not be reached, program staff should complete top portion and questions 1,2,5 and 9.

Identification

For Program Staff Use:

Grantee: _____

Subgrantee/Program: _____ Subgrantee ID Number _____

Participant's Name: _____

FIRST

MIDDLE INITIAL

LAST

S.S. # _____

Date of Exit: _____ / _____ / _____
month day year

Date Form Completed: _____ / _____ / _____
month day year

Participant Information

1. Date you left this community service program:

____ / ____ 19 ____
MONTH DAY YEAR

2. What was the reason you ended your service participation?
(check a or b)

- ☐ (a) Completed program
- ☐ (b) Left Program Early (check reason)
- ☐ Got a job/ expanded working hours
 - ☐ Enrolled in a job program
 - ☐ Enrolled in another service program
 - ☐ Enlisted in military
 - ☐ Enrolled in school
 - ☐ Moved away
 - ☐ Pregnancy
 - ☐ Other health issues
 - ☐ Left at parents' request
 - ☐ Left program for other personal reasons
 - ☐ Quit program because dissatisfied
 - ☐ Have been asked to leave program
 - ☐ Did not like the program or type of service
 - ☐ Other (specify:)

3. How satisfied were you with the program?

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Greatly
1 2 3 4 5

4. a. Do you plan to continue your education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Did your service experience influence this decision?

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ greatly
1 2 3 4 5

c. Have you enrolled in an educational program?

☐ Yes (specify:)
☐ No

5. Did you receive academic credit or a GED as part of your participation? (check if applicable)

- ☐ GED (Graduate Equivalency Diploma)
- ☐ other academic credit

6. How have you benefited from participating in this service program? Pick top two

- ☐ Learned about or worked with different ethnic/cultural groups
- ☐ Explored future job/educational interests
- ☐ Learned about health issues
- ☐ Learned about public safety issues
- ☐ Got to make new friends
- ☐ Learned about education issues
- ☐ Learned about environmental issues
- ☐ Served my community
- ☐ Developed leadership skills
- ☐ Got an educational scholarship
- ☐ Helped others
- ☐ Gained communication skills
- ☐ Learned how to get along on the job (job skills)
- ☐ Accomplished a specific task/completed task
- ☐ Made money
- ☐ Was part of a national movement

7. a. Do you plan to continue to engage in some form of community service?

☐ Yes (specify how:)
☐ No

b. Did your experience in this program influence this decision?

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ greatly
1 2 3 4 5

8. Where is the best place to contact you in the future?
(permanent address)

Street City State Zip

Phone Relationship to you

9. Who completed this form?

- ☐ Participant ☐ Staff

Learn and Serve Participation Summary DRAFT

Grantee: _____ State: _____
 Subgrantee: _____ Subgrantee ID: _____
 Program Date of Operation: _____ thru _____
 Completed By (Please print): _____ Telephone: (____) _____
 Date Form Completed: ____/____/____ FAX Number: (____) _____

Complete this side at the beginning of the grant cycle using estimates and at the end of the grant cycle using actual data.

Total Participants¹	
Total Non-participant Volunteers²	
Number of Beneficiaries (if known)	
Participants Age: 5-10	
11-14	
15-17	
18 - 23	
23 & older	
Gender Male	
Female	
Race/Ethnicity	
White (non-Hispanic)	
African American (non-Hispanic)	
Hispanic / Latino	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	
Grade Level	
Kindergarten - 5	
6th - 8th	
9th - 12th	
College Freshman/Sophomore	
College Junior/Senior	
Graduate Student	
School Dropout	
Other	
Other Characteristics	
Single Parent	
Homeless	
Economically Disadvantaged ³	
Educationally Disadvantaged ⁴	

Complete this side only at end of the grant cycle with actual data.

Status at End of Participation	
A. Satisfactorily Completed Program	
B. Received Academic Credit	
C. Left program early because...	
Returned to School (out-of-school youth)	
Entered Employment	
Entered Military	
Expelled/ Suspended from school	
Quit for Personal Reasons	
Total Participant Hours of Direct Service	
In Education	
In Human Service	
In Environment	
In Public Safety	
In Other Service	
Total Participant Hours of Service Related	
Activities: Classroom Hours	
Other Hours ⁵	
TOTAL PARTICIPANT HOURS⁶	
(direct service and service-related)	
TOTAL Non-Participant Volunteer Hours	

¹ **Total Participants.** Total number of participants who enrolled in program, including those who did not successfully complete it.

² **Total Non-Participant Volunteers.** The number of individuals who, though not enrolled in a program as participants, assist in the operation of the program by providing volunteer services. Example- volunteers at a service event or organized by participants.

³ **Economically Disadvantaged** participants are those who 1) receive, or are members of a family which receives, cash welfare payments under a Federal, state, or local welfare program; 2) have, or are members of a family which has received an annual family income, in relation to family size and location, that did not meet either a) the most recently established poverty levels determined in accordance with criteria established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) b) 70% of the lower living standard income level, whichever is greater; 3) are receiving Food Stamps pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1977;

4) are foster children on behalf of whom state or local government payments are made; 5) are adult disabled individuals whose own income meets the requirements of 1 or 2 above, but who are members of a family whose income does not meet such requirements.

⁴ **Educationally Disadvantaged** includes students eligible for remedial education or other assistance programs.

⁵ **Other Hours.** Includes any community service activities not included in prior categories. Examples include cleanup after natural disasters, special events and public surveys.

⁶ **Total Hours.** Sum of total participant hours of direct service and total participant hours of service related activities.